



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,052	09/12/2003	Berna Erol	015358-009420US	6732
20350 7590 10/28/2008 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
EXAMINER MYINT, DENNIS Y				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2162				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/28/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/661,052

Applicant(s)

EROL ET AL.

Examiner

DENNIS MYINT

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-83 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Applicant's Amendment, filed on July 28, 2008.
2. Claims 1-83 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 22, 31, 42, 52, 61, 69, and 78 are independent claims. In the Amendment filed on July 28, 2008, claims 61, 69 and 78 were amended. **This office action is made final.**

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on July 28, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Referring to the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Applicant argued that *"laims 61-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, these claims are rejected as reciting a "computer-readable medium" which, when read broadly, allegedly includes wireless networks and wireless signals (OA p. 3). Although Applicants do not agree with the rejection, these claims have been amended to instead recite a "computer-readable storage medium", which as defined in the specification does not include a wireless signal or other such transmission medium. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections with respect to claims 61-83 be withdrawn"* (Applicant's argument, page 16, second paragraph).

In response, it is responded that said "computer-readable storage medium" is not explicitly defined/limited in the specification of the claimed invention. As such, said limitation "computer-readable storage medium" is given

the given the broadest interpretation to mean computer-readable storage medium described in Paragraph 0036 of the Specification of the instant application (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 20040205041), wherein wireless network and wireless signals are described. Wireless signals are not statutory. Therefore, claims 61, 69, and 78 are all rejected 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Referring to rejection of claims 1-5, 7-11, 12-16, 18-21, 31-35, 37-51, 61-72, and 74-77 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), Applicant argued that *"In particular, the mere fact that the image authenticity verification process of Narayanaswami can, for sake of argument, be used with the automatic index and table of contents generation system of Jasinchii does not mean that the specific combination and recitation of claim 1 is obvious"* (Applicant's argument, page 17, first paragraph). In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of Jasinschi, which teaches comparing videotaped presentations to source presentations, with the method of Narayana, which also compares recorded information to source

presentations and performs an action when a criteria is met, so that the combined method would comprise comparing recorded information to source presentations and perform a determined action when a criteria of comparison is met. One would have been motivated to confirm the authenticity of the recorded information (Narayana Paragraph 0048).

Applicant argued that *"there is no teaching or suggestion as to how to determine which portion is authentic if the portions are different"* (Applicant's argument page 17, second paragraph).

In response, it is repeated that One would have been motivated to confirm the authenticity of the recorded information (Narayana Paragraph 0048).

Applicant argued that *"It is respectfully submitted that this is non-analogous art, or at least that a person trying to index video or perform a similar task using the Jasinschi approach would have no motivation to look to an image authenticity verification process"* (Applicant's argument, page 17 last paragraph through page 18 first paragraph).

In response, it is pointed out that both Jasinschi and Narayanaswami are from the same field of multimedia content management. As such, these references are analogous art and one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Jasinschi and Narayanaswami. One would have been motivated to confirm the authenticity of the recorded information (Narayana Paragraph 0048).

Applicant also argued that *"Applicants thus respectfully submit that the requirements for a prima facie case for obviousness have not been met, and that*

Art Unit: 2162

the claims are not rendered obvious by these references" (Applicant's arguments, page 18 second paragraph).

In response to applicant's argument, it is pointed out that a prima facie case of obviousness is established when the teachings from the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Once such a case is established, it is incumbent upon appellant to go forward with objective evidence of unobviousness. In re Fielder, 471 F.2d 640, 176 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1973). In this case, one would have been motivated to confirm the authenticity of the recorded information (Narayana Paragraph 0048).

Referring to claims 6, 17, 36, and 73, Applicant argued that *"These claims are not rendered obvious by Jasinschi and Narayanaswami as discussed above"* (Applicant's argument, page 18 last paragraph).

In response, it is pointed out that the independent claims which said dependent claims depend on are rendered obvious by Jasinschi in view of Narayanaswami as discussed above and in the office action and said dependent claims are rendered by Jasinschi in view of Narayanaswami and further in view of Boegelund.

Referring to claims 22-29, 52-59, and 78-82, Applicant argued that *"These claims are not rendered obvious by Jasinschi, Narayanaswami, and Boegelund as discussed above"* (Applicant's argument, page 19 first paragraph).

In response, it is pointed out that the independent claims which said dependent claims depend on are rendered obvious by Jasinschi in view of

Art Unit: 2162

Narayanaswami as discussed above and in the office action and said dependent claims are rendered by Jasinski in view of Narayanaswami and further in view of Lin.

Referring to claims 60, 60, and 83, Applicant argued that "*These claims are not rendered obvious by Jasinski in view of Narayanaswami and further in view of Lin as discussed above*" (Applicant's argument, page 19 last paragraph).

In response, it is pointed out that the independent claims which said dependent claims depend on are rendered obvious by Jasinski in view of Narayanaswami as discussed above and in the office action and said dependent claims are rendered by Jasinski in view of Narayanaswami and further in view of Lin and further in view of Smith.

In view of the above, the examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the claims have been addressed in this Office Action. For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office Action and current Office Action are proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 61-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 61, 69, and 78 all recite in lines 1-2 "a computer program product

Art Unit: 2162

stored on a computer-readable storage medium". However, the specification of the claimed invention fails to define/limit what "computer-readable storage medium" means. As such, said limitation "computer-readable storage medium" is given the given the broadest interpretation to mean computer-readable storage medium described in Paragraph 0036 of the Specification of the instant application (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 20040205041), wherein wireless network and wireless signals are described. Wireless signals are not statutory. Therefore, claims 61, 69, and 78 are all rejected 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

All the dependent claims of said independent claims (i.e., claims 61, 69, and 78) are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 by virtue of their dependency on said independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Art Unit: 2162

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claim 1-5, 7-11, 12-16, 18-21, 31-35, 37-51, and 61-72, 74-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jasinski et al., (hereinafter "Jasinski", U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0164151) in view of Narayanaswami et al., (hereinafter "Narayana", U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0011684).

As per claim 1, Jasinski teaches a method for performing an action (Jasinski, Paragraph 0011, i.e., *method for analyzing the content of videotaped multimedia presentations*) and teaches the limitations:

"accessing recorded information, the recorded information including information recorded during a presentation of source information" (Jasinski, Paragraph 0027, i.e., *FIG 1. illustrates a block diagram of an exemplary multimedia analysis system 100 for analyzing videotaped multimedia signals; and Paragraph 0033, i.e., **Controller 130 must identify the appropriate video images to be used to create a multimedia table of contents.** An advantageous embodiment of the present invention comprises computer software 200 capable of identifying the appropriate **video images** to be used to create a table of contents for the videotaped multimedia material;* Note paragraph

Art Unit: 2162

0036 of Jasinski which recites "a **typical lecture presentation** accompanied by **slides**"; Particular note that said "slides" are "source information" and said "typical lecture presentation" is "presentation of source information"; Also note that said "video images" in paragraph 0033 of Jasinski are "recorded information". Also note paragraph 0031 of Jasinski for "the videotaped multimedia material", which also is "record information";

"comparing the recorded information to a (source) document, the (source) document being separate from the recorded information and being determined to include information corresponding to at least a portion of the source information presented during the presentation" (Jasinski, Paragraph 0042, *In the fourth stage, the video clips that are a part of the lecture presentation ("**lecture video clips**") are segmented. The lecture video clips can be segmented by **comparing** them to the video sequences of **the presentation slides, to the head-and-shoulder views of the lecturer, and to the static images**; and Paragraph 0043, i.e., *In an alternate advantageous embodiment of the present invention, an additional fifth stage of the coarse table of contents segmentation may also be performed. In the fifth stage, "combination" images are segmented. A "combination" image is an image that contains more than one type of image. For example, one type of combination image comprises a static image in which a video clip is superimposed on a portion of the static image. A second type of combination image comprises a video clip in which a static image is superimposed on a portion of the video clip. A third type of combination image comprises a video clip in which a presentation slide is superimposed on a portion**

Art Unit: 2162

of the video clip. Other types of combination images are also possible. If no combination images are present, then the fifth stage of the coarse table of contents segmentation is not necessary);

"determining whether a portion of the (source) document corresponds to a portion of the recorded information, such that a criterion is satisfied" (Jasinschi, Paragraph 0042-0043; "a criterion" here is the similarity between the lecture presentation (lecture video clips) and either one of the following: the video sequences of the presentation slides, , the head-shoulder views of the presenter, and the static images);

"performing an action when the criterion is satisfied, the action performed being associated with the portion of the recorded information" (Jasinschi, Paragraph 0045, i.e., *In particular, **after the four stages of the coarse table of contents segmentation have been performed, the video boundaries between the four sets of images must be accurately determined. That is, the video boundaries between the presentation slides, the head-and-shoulder views of the lecturer, the static images, and the lecture video clips, must be accurately located***);

"sending a result of the action to at least one device" (Jasinschi, Paragraph 0059, i.e., ***After index module 170 has completed its operations, controller 130 stores the resulting table of contents in a table of contents storage location 260 in memory unit 120.***

Jasinschi does explicitly teach the limitation: "comparing a source document, the source document being separate from the recorded information

and being determined to include information corresponding to at least a portion of the source information (during the information)" and "performing a determined action when the criterion is satisfied". Note that Jasinski teaches comparing documents (i.e., comparing recorded documents) of a presentation.

On the other hand, Narayana teaches the limitation:

"comparing a source document, the source document being separate from the recorded information and being determined to include information corresponding to at least a portion of the source information (during the information)" (Narayana, Paragraph 0048, i.e., *It is to be appreciated that image verification processing can also be performed with the watermark processor 134. It is to further appreciated that image verification processing may also be performed by the remote server in which the image archive 210 and the key archive 212 are located. The watermark processor 134 includes a stamping information extractor for receiving a stamped image from the archive 210 and the corresponding verification key of the stamped image from the secured storage of the keys 212. **The stamped source image** and corresponding verification key are processed by the stamping information extractor module 214 wherein the stamping information embedded on the retrieved stamped image is extracted. **The extracted stamping information 216 and the original stamping information 202 (the recorded camera parameter corresponds to the source image) are provided to a comparator module 218, which compares the extracted stamping information with the originally recorded parameters. The result of the verification is then provided to a confirmation/warning module***

220 to either confirm the authenticity of the image (assuming there is a match between the extracted data and the recorded data) or to warn the user of potential fraud and to take appropriate measures (assuming that there is no match between the extracted data and the recorded data). Assuming the verification process is performed in the server system at a remote location, such actions may include alerting the system administration of potential abuse as well as restricting the access of images whose content integrity is under investigation) and

"performing a determined action when the criterion is satisfied" (Narayana, Paragraph 0048, i.e., The result of the verification is then provided to a confirmation/warning module 220 to either confirm the authenticity of the image (assuming there is a match between the extracted data and the recorded data) or to warn the user of potential fraud and to take appropriate measures).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the method of Jasinschi, which teaches comparing videotaped presentations to source presentations, with the method of Narayana, which also compares recorded information to source presentations and performs an action when a criteria is met, so that the combined method would comprise comparing recorded information to source presentations and perform a determined action when a criteria of comparison is met. One would have been motivated to confirm the authenticity of the recorded information (Narayana Paragraph 0048).

As per claim 2, Jasinski in view of Narayana teaches the limitation:

"wherein the information in the recorded information comprises an image of information outputted from the source document" (Jasinski, Paragraph 0042-0043, i.e., *In the fourth stage, the video clips that are a part of the lecture presentation ("lecture video clips") are segmented. The lecture video clips can be segmented by **comparing** them to the video sequences of the presentation slides, **to the head-and-shoulder views of the lecturer**, and to the static images*).

As per claim 3, Jasinski in view of Narayana teaches the limitation::

"wherein determining the source document comprises comparing an image in the source document with the image of information outputted from the source document to determine if the image in the source document matches the image of information outputted from the source document" (Jasinski, Paragraph 0042, *In the fourth stage, the video clips that are a part of the lecture presentation ("lecture video clips") are segmented. The lecture video clips can be segmented by **comparing** them to the video sequences of the presentation slides, **to the head-and-shoulder views of the lecturer**, and to the static images*; and Paragraph 0043, i.e., *In an alternate advantageous embodiment of the present invention, an additional fifth stage of the coarse table of contents segmentation may also be performed. In the fifth stage, "combination" images are segmented. A "combination" image is an image that contains more than one type of image. For example, one type of combination image comprises a static*

Art Unit: 2162

image in which a video clip is superimposed on a portion of the static image. A second type of combination image comprises a video clip in which a static image is superimposed on a portion of the video clip. A third type of combination image comprises a video clip in which a presentation slide is superimposed on a portion of the video clip. Other types of combination images are also possible. If no combination images are present, then the fifth stage of the coarse table of contents segmentation is not necessary).

As per claim 4, Jasinski in view of Narayana teaches the limitation:

"wherein the information from the source document comprises an image"
(Jasinski, Paragraph 0042-0043).

As per claim 5, Jasinski in view of Narayana teaches the limitation:

"wherein performing the action comprises performing the action using the image" (Jasinski, Paragraph 0042-0043).

As per claim 7, Jasinski in view of Narayana teaches the limitation:

"wherein determining if the criterion is satisfied comprises: associating information from the recorded information with the information in the source document; and associating the information in the source document with information for the criterion" (Jasinski in view of Narayana, particularly Jasinski, Figure 4, i.e., *TIME, TABLE OF CONTENTS, PRESENTATION SLIDES*, and Paragraph 0030, i.e., *Controller 130 creates a table of contents*

Art Unit: 2162

that displays information that summarizes the content of the videotaped multimedia material. The table of contents generally comprises a combination of video signals, audio signals, and text signals. The table of contents is capable of displaying (1) text, and (2) still video images comprising a single video frame, and (3) moving video images (referred to as a video "clip" or a video "segment") comprising a series of video frames, and (4) text transcribed from audio signals, and (5) any combination thereof).

As per claim 8, Jasinski in view of Narayana teaches the limitation:

"wherein information for the criterion and action associated with the criterion is associated with the source document" (Jasinski in view of Narayana, Particularly Jasinski, Figure 4 and Jasinski, Figure 4, i.e., *TIME, TABLE OF CONTENTS, PRESENTATION SLIDES*, and Paragraph 0030, i.e., *Controller 130 creates a table of contents that displays information that summarizes the content of the videotaped multimedia material. The table of contents generally comprises a combination of video signals, audio signals, and text signals. The table of contents is capable of displaying (1) text, and (2) still video images comprising a single video frame, and (3) moving video images (referred to as a video "clip" or a video "segment") comprising a series of video frames, and (4) text transcribed from audio signals, and (5) any combination thereof*)

As per claim 9, Jasinski in view of Narayana teaches the limitation:

Art Unit: 2162

"wherein the information associated with the source document is embedded in the source document" (Jasinschi, Paragraph 0030, i.e. *text*).

As per claim 10, Jasinschi in view of Narayana teaches the limitation:

"wherein the recorded information comprises information identifying the information in the source document that has been outputted" (Jasinschi, Figure 4).

As per claim 11, Jasinschi in view of Narayana teaches the limitation:

"wherein the recorded information comprises an identifier, wherein the identifier is used to determine the information in the source document" (Jasinschi, Figure 4, i.e., *TIME, TABLE OF CONTENTS, PRESENTATION SLIDES*, and Paragraph 0030).

Claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, and 21 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1, 2, 4, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, and 11 respectively.

Claim 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41 are rejected on the same basis as claim 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 respectively.

Claims 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51 are rejected on the same basis as claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 respectively.

Claims 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 68 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 respectively.

Claims 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, and 77 are rejected on the same basis as claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, and 21 respectively.

9. Claims 6, 17, 36, and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jasinski in view of Narayana and further view of Boegelund et al., (hereinafter "Boegelund", U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0101043).

Referring to claim 6, Jasinski in view of Narayana does not explicitly the limitation: "wherein performing the action comprises communicating a translated image to a device".

On the other hand, Boegelund teaches the limitation:

"wherein performing the action comprises communicating a translated image to a device" (Boegelund, Paragraph 0042 and Figure 4, i.e. "*the text is then translated to the new language*" and Paragraph 0047). Boegelund teaches a method and system for translating slide presentations into different languages, wherein texts in presentation slides are translated from one language to another and displayed (Boegelund et al., Paragraph 0042 and Figure 4, i.e. "*the text is then translated to the new language.*" and Paragraph 0047).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the to combine the method and system for translating presentation slides from one language to another as taught by Boegelund with the system and method of Jasinski in view of Narayana so that the combined method and system would constitute the method of claim 4, wherein performing

the action comprises communicating a translated image of the image to a device (Boegelund, Paragraph 0042 and 0047 and Lin, Paragraph 0029-0031, i.e. "when the multimedia data object is replayed using a computer controllable display screen and an audio device....."). One would have been motivated to do so in order to "*have a method that can translate presentation slide information from one language to a second language in an efficient and accurate and cost-effective manner*" (Boegelund, Paragraph 0014).

Claim 17 is rejected on the same basis as claim 6.

Claim 36 and 73 are rejected on the same basis as claim 6.

10. Claims 22-29, 52-59, and 78-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jasinski in view of Narayana and further view of Boegelund and further in view of Lin (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0205477).

As per claim 22, Jasinski in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund teaches the limitations:

"accessing recorded information, the recorded information including information recorded during a presentation of source information from at least one source document separate from the recorded information" (Jasinski, Paragraph 0027, i.e., *FIG 1. illustrates a block diagram of an exemplary multimedia analysis system 100 for analyzing videotaped multimedia signals*; and Paragraph 0033, i.e., *Controller 130 must identify the appropriate video*

images to be used to create a multimedia table of contents. *An advantageous embodiment of the present invention comprises computer software 200 capable of identifying the appropriate video images to be used to create a table of contents for the videotaped multimedia material);*

"comparing a source document slide in the at least one source document to an image containing in the recorded information, a criteria being satisfied if the source document slide corresponds to the image" (Narayana, Paragraph 0048 in view of Jasinski, Paragraph 0042, *In the fourth stage, the video clips that are a part of the lecture presentation ("lecture video clips") are segmented. The lecture video clips can be segmented by **comparing** them to the video sequences of the presentation slides, **to the head-and-shoulder views of the lecturer, and to the static images;** and Paragraph 0043); and*

"communicating a translated slide to a device when the criteria is satisfied, the translated slide including a translation of at least a portion of the source document slide," (Boegelund et al., Paragraph 0042 and Figure 4, i.e. *"the text is then translated to the new language"*, and Paragraph 0047).

Jasinski in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund does not teach the limitation: "whereby the device is operable to display the translated slide while accessing the portion of the accessed recorded information".

On the other hand Lin teaches the limitation:

"whereby the device is operable to display the translated slide while accessing the portion of the accessed recorded information" (Lin, Paragraph 0028-0028, i.e. "Synchronization of the overlaid replayable bitstreams..." ; and

Paragraph 0029-0031, i.e. *"when the multimedia data object is replayed using a computer controllable display screen and an audio device....."*).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of displaying a slide while accessing the portion of the accessed recorded information to the method of Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund so that the resultant method would display translated slides while accessing the portion of the accessed recorded information. One would have been motivated to do so in order to produce a replayable recording of the real-time presentation (Lin, Paragraph 0006).

Referring to claim 23, Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund and further in view of Lin as applied above with regard to claim 22 discloses the invention as claimed. Jasinschi in view of Narayana and further in view of Boegelund is directed to the method of claim 22, "wherein determining the translated slide comprises translating text of the source document slide to generate the translated slide" (Boegelund et al., Paragraph 0042 and Figure 4, i.e. "the text is then translated to the new language." and Lin, Paragraph 0028-0028, i.e. "Synchronization of the overlaid replayable bitstreams...").

Referring to claim 24, Lin in view of Boegelund et al. as applied above with regard to claim 22 discloses the invention as claimed. Lin in view of Boegelund is directed the method of claim 22, wherein determining the translated slide comprises:

Art Unit: 2162

"determining a storage location of the translated slide" (Boegelund, Paragraph 0048, i.e. "*storage and retrieval*"); and

"retrieving the translated slide from the storage location" (Boegelund, Paragraph 0048, i.e. "*storage and retrieval*").

Referring to claim 25, Lin in view of Boegelund et al. as applied above with regard to claim 22 discloses the invention as claimed. Lin in view of Boegelund et al. is directed the method of claim 22, "wherein communicating the translated slide to a device comprises causing the translated slide to be displayed on the device" (Lin, Paragraph 0029-0031, i.e. "when the multimedia data object is replayed using a computer controllable display screen and an audio device.....").

Referring to claim 26, Lin in view of Boegelund et al. as applied above with regard to claim 22 discloses the invention as claimed. Lin in view of Boegelund et al. is directed the method of claim 22, "wherein communicating the translated slide to a device comprises storing the translated slide" (Lin, Paragraph 0029-0031, i.e. "when the multimedia data object is replayed using a computer controllable display screen and an audio device.....").

Referring to claim 27, Lin in view of Boegelund et al. as applied above with regard to claim 22 discloses the invention as claimed. Lin in view of Boegelund et al. is directed the method of claim 22, "wherein the recorded information

Art Unit: 2162

comprises an image of an outputted source document slide" (Lin, Paragraph 0025, 0027, 0033 and 0035).

Referring to claim 28, Lin in view of Boegelund et al. as applied above with regard to claim 27 discloses the invention as claimed. Lin in view of Boegelund is directed the method of claim 27, "wherein determining the source document slide comprises comparing the image of the outputted source document slide to information in the source document slide to determine if the image of the outputted source document matches the information in the source document slide" (Lin, Paragraph 0028, i.e. "For example, Fig. 1D shows a replayed slide *corresponding* to the captured image of the real-time slide presentation").

Referring to claim 29, Lin in view of Boegelund et al. as applied above with regard to claim 27 discloses the invention as claimed. Lin in view of Boegelund is directed the method of claim 27, "wherein the recorded information comprises information indicating that the source document slide in the source document has been outputted" (Lin, Paragraph 0025-0028 and 0033-0036).

Claims 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, and 59 are rejected on the same basis as claims 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29 respectively.

Claims 78, 79, 80, 81, and 82 are rejected on the same basis as claims 22, 24, 27, 28, and 29 respectively.

11. Claims 30, 60 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jasinski in view of Narayana and further view of Boegelund and further in view of Lin and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0205601).

Referring to claim 30, Jasinski in view of Narayana and further view of Boegelund and further in view of Lin as applied to claim 27 above does not explicitly recite that slide number is used to determine the source document slide. However, Smith teaches a method and system for identifying, classifying, extracting and resolving hidden data in slides, wherein slide numbers are used to determine slides in a source document (Smith Paragraph 0073).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of employing slide number to identify/determine slides in a source document as taught by Smith to the method and system of Jasinski in view of Narayana and further view of Boegelund and further in view of Lin so that, in the resultant method and system, the recorded information would comprise a slide number, wherein the slide number is used to determine the source document slide. One would have been motivated to do so simply because slide numbers are used in the art to identify slides and that has been a well-known method in the art.

Claim 60 is rejected on the same basis as claim 30.

Claim 83 is rejected on the same basis as claim 30.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Myint whose telephone number is (571) 272-5629. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2162

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/dennis myint/
Dennis Myint
Examiner
AU-2162

/John Breene/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2162